

Criterion 1 (8 points)

Demonstrated Record of Effectiveness in Increasing Student Academic Achievement

(Limit 4 pages, double-spaced)

Applicant provides evidence that its instructional program has a positive impact on the academic achievement of students in the subject(s) in which applicant proposes to provide services, particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students. If applicant proposes to serve students with disabilities or limited English proficiency, applicant provides evidence that its instructional program has a positive impact on the academic achievement of those student population(s). Applicant includes citations to available research studies (as appropriate) and specific data.

Ideal Indicators: The applicant provides specific evidence (i.e., data, research citations) that its instructional program has a positive impact on the student achievement of the targeted student population and in the subject(s) and grades proposed. Positive impact on Michigan's state assessments (i.e., MME or MEAP scores) will be given the most weight.

Other evidence that should be addressed includes:

- Positive impact on national, state, and/or district assessments;
- Positive impact on other independent, valid and reliable assessments (e.g., provider-administered pre- and post-assessments, teacher-administered content area assessments).

Scoring Range: 0-8 points available Minimum Score Required for this Criterion: 4				
8 points	6 points	4 points	2 points	0 points
Detailed objective information with clearly written examples is provided. Data demonstrates an impact on achievement including state assessment results.	Objective data are presented but the causal relationship to improving achievement is weak. State achievement data are not used.	Anecdotal or testimonial data is presented for the majority of students served. A qualified educator can recognize how instructional strategies impact achievement positively.	Anecdotal or testimonial information is presented; information is less systematic and does not represent a majority of students served.	Applicant does not provide a response. A qualified educator will question how the instructional strategies impact achievement positively. Response does not address the question.

Criterion 2 (8 points)

Evidence of a High-Quality, Research-Based Instructional Program Designed to Increase Student Academic Achievement **(Limit 4 pages, double-spaced)**

Applicant demonstrates that the instructional program is (1) high-quality and research-based; and (2) designed to increase student academic achievement.

Applicant describes the findings of any academic research that supports major elements of the instructional program. Major elements must include mode of instruction, class size, time on task, special instructional materials, use of technology, etc.

Ideal Indicators: Applicant clearly and specifically explains the ways in which its instructional program is:

- High-quality and research-based;
- Designed to increase student academic achievement; and
- Supported by academic research.

Scoring Range: 0-8 points available Minimum Score Required for this Criterion: 4				
8 points	6 points	4 points	2 points	0 points
All major elements of the instructional program, including specific instructional strategies, are listed and supported by research. Research clearly indicates that each instructional strategy, and each major program component, has a history of increasing student academic achievement with the target population.	Instructional strategies and all other major elements of the instructional program are identified. Research clearly supports some of the instructional strategies and major program components. The program has a history of effectiveness with the target population.	Some specific instructional strategies and major program components are identified. Research is cited that will allow a qualified educator to reasonably assume that the identified program components and specific instructional strategies have a history of increasing student academic achievement.	Few instructional strategies and other major program components are identified. Research information does not demonstrate a clear history of increasing student academic achievement, or it is difficult to ascertain how the research is connected to the instructional strategies and other major components of the program.	Applicant did not provide a response. Response does not address the questions, or response provides no objective evidence of quality research based instructional effectiveness in increasing academic achievement.

Criterion 3 (4 points)

Evidence of an Instructional Program and Content Consistent with State Standards and LEA Program(s) – *Connection to Content Expectations (Limit 1 page, double-spaced)*

Ideal Indicator: Applicant describes how the instructional program connects to specific content expectations identified by the State and LEA.

Scoring Range: 0-4 points available Minimum Score Required for this Criterion: 2				
4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points
Exemplary evidence is provided that demonstrates the instructional program is aligned to both the State and LEA content expectations. Sample aligned learner outcomes are provided.	Systematic evidence is provided that demonstrates the instructional program is aligned to both the State and LEA content expectations.	A small but sufficient sample of evidence is provided that demonstrates the instructional program is aligned to the State and at least one of the LEAs identified in the Applicant's service area.	The instructional program appears to be aligned to either the State or LEA content expectations. Insufficient evidence has been provided to document the alignments.	Applicant did not provide a response. The response does not address alignment to State or LEA content expectations.

Criterion 4 (4 points)

Evidence of an Instructional Program and Content Consistent with State Standards and LEA Program(s) – *Staff Qualifications (Limit 1 page, double-spaced)*

Ideal Indicators: Applicant describes a process for ensuring staff is qualified and includes a plan for ongoing professional development and supervision that addresses:

- Instructional strategies;
- Focus on learning;
- Assessment and communication of progress;
- Documentation;
- Differentiation of instruction based on diagnostic and student needs; and
- Feedback.

Scoring Range: 0-4 points available Minimum Score Required for this Criterion: 2				
4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points
Detailed instructor qualifications with clearly written examples are provided. Instructors are selected on the basis of criteria that indicate they exhibit superior qualifications. Examples may include currently or formerly certified English language arts and/or math teachers certified in any state. There is an effective plan for professional development and supervision.	Clearly defined qualifications of instructors are evident and reasonable. Instructors are selected on the basis of criteria that indicate they exceed the minimum qualifications. Examples may include individuals that are not certified teachers, but that hold a BA or MA. Most of the professional development and supervision indicators are addressed effectively.	Instructors are required to meet the minimum requirement of having a high school diploma. Most indicators of professional development and supervision are addressed effectively.	Instructors meet the minimum requirement of holding a high school diploma. Professional development and supervision plan are minimally addressed but are not systematic.	Applicant did not provide a response. Qualifications of the instructors do not meet the minimum criteria, and there is no professional development or supervision plan.

Criterion 5 (4 points)

Evidence of Instructional Program and Content Consistent with State Standards and LEA Program(s)
– *Assessment of Student Need (Limit 1 page, double-spaced)*

Ideal Indicator: Applicant describes the specific process used to assess student need, identify skill or knowledge gaps, and prescribes an instructional program based on the student’s individual needs.

Scoring Range: 0-4 points available Minimum Score Required for this Criterion: 2				
4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points
Applicant describes objective assessment(s) to be used frequently, has a systematic process for analyzing results to identify student needs and uses a variety of instructional strategies that will effectively differentiate instruction to meet student needs.	Applicant describes objective assessment(s) to be used on a regular basis, and has a systematic process for analyzing results to identify student needs. Instructional strategies are limited.	Objective assessment(s) are infrequent or instructors rely on their own expertise to define student needs. Instructional strategies are limited.	Instructors rely solely on their own judgment to define student needs and identify instructional strategies.	Applicant did not provide a response, or there is little evidence that instruction will meet student needs.

Criterion 6 (4 points)

Evidence of Instructional Program and Content Consistent with State Standards and LEA Program(s) – *Communication Plan*

Ideal Indicators: Applicant describes the plan for communicating student progress to LEA(s)/teacher(s) and to parent(s)/guardian(s).

- Process for identifying specific instructional goals is identified;
- Written progress reports occur regularly;
- Communication between the applicant and the stakeholders is documented.

Scoring Range: 0-4 points available Minimum Score Required for this Criterion: 2				
4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points
All stakeholders (parent, teacher and tutor) are required to meet and discuss specific instructional goals for each student. All parties sign an individualized learning plan. Frequent written reports (e.g., every two weeks) monitoring progress toward specific instructional goals are distributed to all stakeholders. A communication log is maintained for each student. Tutors are required to contact the teacher and parent frequently by email or phone to discuss student progress.	All stakeholders (parent, teacher and tutor) are required to meet and discuss specific instructional goals for each student. All parties sign an individualized learning plan. Written reports (e.g., monthly) monitoring progress toward specific instructional goals are distributed to all stakeholders. A communication log is maintained for each student. Tutors are encouraged to contact the teacher and parent frequently by email or phone to discuss student progress.	All stakeholders (parent, teacher and tutor) collaborate to identify instructional goals for each student. The individualized learning plan is signed by the tutor and parent and a copy is provided to the teacher. Written reports (e.g., monthly) monitoring progress toward specific instructional goals are distributed to all stakeholders. A communication log is maintained for each student. Tutors are encouraged to contact the teacher and parent frequently by email or phone to discuss student progress.	Some stakeholders (parent, teacher and tutor) collaborate to identify instructional goals for each student. The stakeholders are provided a copy of the individualized learning plan. Written progress reports occur infrequently (e.g., quarterly) and have limited distribution. A communication log is not maintained.	Applicant did not provide a response. Response did not address the indicators.

Criterion 7 (8 points)

Financial Soundness and Management Structure

Ideal Indicators: Applicant clearly demonstrates at least two years of financial soundness in the education industry, in each of the documents required by the application. Exemplary management processes related to billing and payments have been identified with corresponding sample documents. All resources and expenses necessary to service the minimum and maximum number of students have been identified. The Applicant provides a clear explanation of the fee per student per hour of instruction that is determined to be reasonable. The hourly rate will allow the average student to receive enough services to positively impact achievement.

Scoring Range: 0-8 points available Minimum Score Required for this Criterion: 4				
8 points	6 points	4 points	2 points	0 points
Financial documents clearly indicate two years of financial soundness in the education industry. Exemplary billing and payment processes, focused on ensuring accuracy and timeliness, are systematic and supported by documentation. A complete and appropriate list of resources and expenses has been identified. The hourly fee is justified and likely to allow students the hours necessary to increase achievement.	Financial documents clearly indicate one year of financial soundness in the education industry and a reasonable business plan forecasting fiduciary success for one additional year. Systematic billing and payment processes are documented. Expenses and resources have been identified. The hourly fee is justified and likely to allow students the hours necessary to increase achievement.	Financial documents clearly indicate two years of financial soundness in a non-education industry, or a reasonable business plan forecasts two years of financial success. Billing and payment processes are less systematic (e.g., a software program or electronic billing system is not used). The hourly fee is adequate to cover identified resources and expenses and likely to allow students the minimum hours necessary to increase achievement.	One of the indicators is not addressed adequately (financial soundness, billing and payments, resources and expenses, fee structure), or there is a documented history of formal complaints related to poor business practices such as non-payment of instructors or excessively late invoicing.	More than one of the indicators is not addressed adequately (financial soundness, billing and payments, resources and expenses, fee structure), or there is a documented history of formal complaints related to poor business practices such as non-payment of instructors or excessively late invoicing.